

# CWT Data Status for 2017

## Regional Committee on Marking and Tagging

As of 4/20/2017

Dan Webb

The focus of this discussion is to review the reporting status of CWT database and identify any obstacles to reporting, validating and processing of the data.

### **Changes in Data Reporting:**

After a few years of new personnel filling positions for various agencies, the individual data providers have appeared to remain fairly constant since the last RCMT meeting. The current list of contacts per agency and data types submitted can be viewed on the RMPC Publications – Reporting Agency Contact List web page. NOTE that some of the agency acronyms have recently been updated.

California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) – Jennifer Simon & Vanessa Gusman are two staff personnel currently in training to start providing recovery and catch/sample data after Melodie Palmer retires from the position sometime in the near future.

Quileute Nation (QUIL) – Currently working with WDFW to report recovery and catch/sample data

### **Locations**

All locations necessary for Coded Wire Tag (CWT) validation and processing purposes are up to date.

### **Releases**

All reporting agencies have updated release datasets since Sept. 2016. Only one release dataset from Colville Confederated Tribes - CCT has pending validation for 6 tag codes. Most agencies have updated the datasets since early January 2017. We have not been notified this year of any new missing tag codes causing delays in the reporting of recovery datasets. Therefore, without performing additional detailed trend analysis, we have no reason to assume that any release sets from last year are missing at this time.

There are currently no releases in the CWT database with the Preliminary (PRELIM) status. NOTE: Preliminary (PRELIM) status was formerly identified as Mid-year (MIDYEAR).

## **Recoveries**

Recoveries were reviewed for data sets with outstanding errors and years missing up to and including the 2015 run year. 2016 run year data sets are not yet evaluated as missing since reporting of the run year may be dependent upon escapement data that is still unavailable.

Most reporting agencies have reported recovery data sets for run years up to and including 2015. Exceptions are as follows:

California Department of Fish and Wildlife - Klamath/Trinity (CDFWKT) – 2008 thru 2011 data sets are missing.

Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission (CRFC) – 2002 thru present data sets are now being reported by individual tribal agencies. Their only remaining data sets are for 2000 & 2001 and are for the Yakama Nation (YAKA) sampling agency.

Quinault Department of Natural Resources (QDNR) – 2013 data set was submitted in April 2015 but has not yet passed validation. 2014 & 2015 are currently being submitted and validated.

Quileute Tribe (QUIL) – 2010 data errors. They are currently working with Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) to resolve missing datasets. These datasets may now be reported as part of the WDFW catch/sample and recovery data.

Yakama Nation (YAKA) have not yet reported 2015 recovery datasets.

Yurok Tribe Fisheries Program (YTFP) – No new status.

## **Catch/Sample**

Catch/Sample was reviewed with the same criteria as the recovery data for missing data sets and data sets with errors.

Catch/Sample datasets typically mirror the results of recoveries. Following is a list of identified exceptions:

California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) – 2013 data set has 2 errors for escapement and fishery conflicts.

Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG) and Nez Perce Tribe (NEZP) submit recovery datasets but do not submit catch/sample datasets.

Quileute Tribe (QUIL) – 2009 data has 2 errors.

Yakama Nation (YAKA) – 2008 data has 1 error, 2009 & 2010 are missing.

Yurok Tribe Fisheries Program (YTFP) – No new status.

## **Monthly Data Integrity Reports**

We continue to notice occasional data discrepancies in monthly data integrity reports and notify agencies as they occur. Most agencies are quite responsive at resolving the discrepancies that are identified.

## **Follow up on Missing Tag Codes & ½ Length Tag Type Issues**

We have noticed a decline in issues related to missing tag codes and ½ length tag types since updating validation rules, introducing the KGT – “Known Good Tag”, and notifying agencies of data discrepancies identified through monthly data integrity reports. The cooperation with all of the various agencies either directly with each other and/or through working with the RMPC shop appears to have decreased cross data type errors significantly.